



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| TIMOTHY W. ARTHUR, | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | |
| vs. | § | CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-4362-MGL |
| | § | |
| DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS | § | |
| and NANCY WILLIAMS, | § | |
| Defendant. | § | |

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING THIS MATTER WITHOUT PREJUDICE,
WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS,
AND WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**

Plaintiff Timothy W. Arthur (Arthur) filed this lawsuit against Defendants Department of Veterans Affairs and Nancy Williams. He is representing himself.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting this case be dismissed without issuance and service of process and without leave to amend. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on August 12, 2024, but Arthur failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. It is therefore the judgment of the Court this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, without issuance and service of process, and without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 3rd day of September, 2024, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.